REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The present supplemental amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 12, 2010. In view of the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-19 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. The claims are not believed to be narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the courtesy granted to Applicant's attorney, Michael A.

Scaturro (Reg. No. 51,356), during a telephonic interview conducted on Tuesday, May 25,
2010. During the telephonic interview, discussion was conducted regarding the Examiner's remarks made in the Final Office Action of January 12, 2010. Specifically, the Examiner suggested that by incorporating claim language into independent claims 1 and 7 which recites, "a succession of consecutive interleaved units, each interleaved unite comprising one and only one corresponding block of each of the common information stream parts and one and only one corresponding block of each of the alternative information streams", the case would be deemed allowable. Applicant's Attorney agreed to incorporate the suggested claim limitations to move the matter towards allowance. The Examiner further suggested to amend independent claim 7 by reciting "a Non-transitory record medium" to remove any potential 101 objections to the claim. Here again, Applicant's Attorney agreed to incorporate the suggested claim limitations to move the matter towards allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

A. Rejection of Claims 1-19

In the Office Action, Claims 1–19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,907,190 ("Kashiwagi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,507 ("Yamauchi"). Applicant respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-19 are allowable

Independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to better define Applicant's invention over the combination of Kashiwagi and Yamauchi. Claims 1 and 7 now recite limitations and/or features which are not disclosed by Kashiwagi and Yamauchi, alone and in combination. Specifically, the cited portions of Kashiwagi and Yamauchi, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claims 1 and 7. For example, the cited portions of Kashiwagi and Yamauchi Averbuch do not disclose or suggest, "and using media write means for recording the information stream on a physical media as a succession of consecutive interleaved units, each interleaved unit comprising one and only one corresponding block of each of the common information stream parts and one and only one corresponding block of each of the alternative information streams, the common information stream blocks being separate from the alternative information stream blocks", as recited in claims 1 and 7. In contrast to claims 1 and 7, the combination of Kashiwagi and Yamauchi results in more than one corresponding block of the common information stream parts and the alternative information streams.

Claims 2-6 and 8-19 depend from claims 1 and 7 respectively, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claims 1 and 7.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-19 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-945-6000 (general number).

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Scaturro Reg. No. 51,356

Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address: Intellectual Property Counsel Philips Electronics North America Corp. P.O. Box 3001 345 Scarborough Road Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001